

I have always meant, some day,
to write out the systematic part
anew, and should be well satisfied
to bring the arrangement or sequence
of orders into conformity with
Hark. & Benth. Gen. Pl.

Suppose you edit an English
ed. of the book, leaving out and
putting in just what you like -
-letting me see the proofs - and I
will help you. There are

many detailed matters I should
correct, which, the work being
stereotyped prevents me from
doing now, - and which may
not be done here for a good while.

You can count upon my coopera-
tion, if you think it worth while
to act on the idea.

Ever Yours truly

Asa Gray

Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.
April 14, 1852.

My Dear Prof. Oliver,

Many thanks for your
interesting note and enclosures
of March 12.

I have been waiting with
interest to receive your paper
on the author. It is now
too late to notice it in the May
no. of Billings's Journal; but I
hope to make a few remarks on
it in the July no. At present
I can scarcely find time to read
it. I am still inclined to imag-
ine (and that is all) that the type
of the author is best represented by
the prevalent conception, and that
that may be harmonized with your
observations, - allowing of course that
only the upper stratum of the lamina
may be cone polleniferous, and that
the debiscence - evinced by the weak

point in the common view - may be all as you say.
Is not the greater frequency of intranses rather
as readily applicable by noting the position of a crust
lamina relative to the petiole? It being
intrans. And lateral dehiscence is the
normal rule, ~~whether~~ in anthers other than ~~of~~ ~~anthers~~
whether intrans or extrane. Liliaceae, by the way,
it is not generally trans, but the anthers extrane
intrans. While the dehiscence is lateral or slightly
intrans.

I note with all approval your remarks on p.
425, and I always wondered how Bentham
took up such a notion. I do not fancy that
the secretion of the glands in the bracts of
Calophyllum acted like pollen to fertilize the
ovules. Stone's nodding!

I must take the point of Hooker's
enquiry made for you about
Protocalla. It is now quite
clear. You ask why I included
it along with Crivicaulon. Is
among plants common only to
E. America & Europe? Why -
because in N. America it is met
with only eastward - does not ad-
vance westward - as you see also
in Hooker's Table of Arctic Pl.
also. To be sure it does
occur in Asia as far E. as Siberia
- and so you may suppose Platanus
Nilly, and I don't say just by
that the communication was that way
but I was only stating the fact, that
it "points in the opposite direction".
- You can turn the point over
well, and of course I like your
view, and would willingly accept your
explanation.

The Atlantic hypothesis, if good
for anything, must apply to an
earlier period.

About Bot. Foot Book. I
believe I once replied to your
suggestion - Thos. Hooker, that I
should be well enough pleased to see
it carried out, if you think it would
be useful and worth the while. -